

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 7, 37, and 45-47 are allowed.

**Disposition of Claims**

Claims 1, 4-15, 30, and 34-47 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Further, claims 7 and 45-47 are indicated as allowed.

**Claim Amendments**

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify the present invention and to correct a minor typographical error. Specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the job managing means creates a managed job which is used to generate image data, and the image data is used to print the job. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, in Figure 16 and associated text in the Specification. No new subject matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 4, 8-15, 34, and 38-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 8,181,436 ("Kurachi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,633,992 ("Gyllenskog"), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,683 ("Chen"). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention relates to a printer that can manage jobs based on identification information. In particular, a series of print job data that includes multiple print jobs in succession is received via a RAW-mode physical channel. Each print job is

extracted based on a start-end pattern and an end-edge pattern to obtain an accepted job. Specifically, the data between the start-end pattern and the end-pattern constitute a single complete print job. Accordingly, the data is grouped into an accepted job. The accepted job then has identification information added so that the accepted job can be managed.

Turning to the rejection, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (See MPEP §2143.03). Further, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." (See MPEP §2143.03).

In order to support the rejection, the Examiner asserts that Chen teaches accepting data from a start-end pattern and Kurachi teaches an end-edge pattern. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that it is inherent in Kurachi to have an end-edge pattern because Kurachi teaches accepting multiple print jobs. (See Office Action dated May 11, 2006, page 8). However, "to establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is **necessarily present** in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, **may not** be established by **probabilities or possibilities**. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.' " In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (emphasis added).

The mere fact that Kurachi can accept multiple print jobs does not mean that it is inherent in Kurachi to have an end-edge pattern. In particular, in a network environment in which data is transmitted via packets (such as the environment disclosed by Kurachi) each packet has a header. The header of the packet may state the size of the packet and location of the packet in relation to all packets sent in the transmission. Because the header has all that is necessary to obtain the entire transmission, *no end-edge pattern is required*. For example, the header of a last packet of a print job may have an indication that it is the last packet and it is 8 bytes long. Thus, the receiving device is able to identify the end of the

print job just by counting the number of bytes in the last packet. In such scenario, no end edge pattern is used. As shown above, the end edge pattern is not necessary for Kurachi, therefore an end-edge pattern is not inherent in Kurachi.

As shown above, Kurachi fails to teach or suggest an end-edge pattern. Moreover, Chen fails to teach or suggest that which Kurachi lacks. Specifically, Chen relates to nesting a single print job with commands related to finishing functions (*i.e.*, stapling, shrink wrapping, etc) for the print job in a data stream. (*See, i.e.*, Chen Abstract and col. 2, ll. 22-28). Chen does not disclose an end or a beginning to a print job. However, while not explicitly disclosed, the print job may have a header that identifies the number of pages in the print job. When the printer has printed the number of pages, then the printer knows the end of the print job exists. Thus, an end edge pattern as recited in the claims of the current application is not even inherent in Chen.

In addition, Chen does not teach a start-end pattern for the start of a print job. Specifically, the portion relied upon by the Examiner teaches a command that indicates the start of a sheet. (*See* Office Action dated May 11, 2006, page 4). However, Chen clearly distinguishes between a job and a sheet in that multiple sheets belong to the same print job. (*See, i.e.*, Chen col. 5, ll. 35-37). Thus, the command for the start of a sheet taught by Chen is not comparable to the start-end pattern required by the amended claims of the current application.

Furthermore, Chen fails to teach or suggest receiving print jobs *in succession* as asserted by the Examiner. Chen may receive multiple print jobs, but Chen does not disclose *how* the print jobs are received (*i.e.*, in succession, in parallel, etc.). The portions relied upon by the Examiner teaches receiving logical sheets that belong to the *same* print job in one portion of Chen and outputting completed print jobs in a different portion of Chen. However, as previously stated, how the print jobs are received in order to be outputted is not disclosed by Chen.

Moreover, Gyllenskog does not teach that which Chen and Kurachi lack. This is evidenced by the fact that Gyllenskog is only relied upon to teach a RAW-mode physical channel for communicating data in series and that the RAW Mode is a serial interface, a parallel interface, and/or a USB interface. (See Office Action dated May 11, 2006, page 3 and 7).

In view of the above, it is clear that because neither Chen, Kurachi, nor Gyllenskog teach the limitation “accepting data in the series of reception data from a start-end pattern data to an end-edge pattern data to obtain accepted data,” the aforementioned references, whether considered together or separately, fail to support the rejection of independent claim 1. Claims 4, 8-15, 34, and 38-44 which depend from claim 1 are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 30, 35, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurachi in view of Gyllenskog in further view of Chen, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,747 (“Reilly”). To the extent that this rejection applies to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As shown above, neither Chen, Kurachi, nor Gyllenskog teaches that extracting the print job comprises: accepting data in the series of reception data from a start-end pattern data to an end-edge pattern data to obtain accepted data and grouping the accepted data into the accepted job. Further, Reilly does not teach that which Chen, Kurachi, and Gyllenskog lack. This is evidenced by the fact that Reilly is only relied upon to teach page description language and a specified language kind. (See Office Action dated May 11, 2006, page 7 and 8).

In view of the above, it is clear that Kurachi, Chen, Gyllenskog and Reilly, whether considered together or separately, fail to support the rejection of claim 5, 6, 30, 35, and 36. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places the present application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 04783/018001).

Dated: August 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan P. Osha  
Registration No.: 33,986  
OSHA · LIANG LLP  
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800  
Houston, Texas 77010  
(713) 228-8600  
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant